(ii) for sub-clause (3), the following sub-clause shall be substituted, namely—

'(3) A person shall not be qualified to be chosen from a territorial constituency to fill a seat in a Taluk Board unless,

(i) in the case of a seat reserved for the Scheduled Castes, such person is a member of those castes; and

(ii) in the case of a seat reserved for women, such person is a woman'."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That Clause 102, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 102, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That Clause 1, the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, the Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—I beg to move:

"That the Mysore Village Panchayats and Local Boards Bill, 1959, as reported by the Joint Select Committee and as amended, be passed."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That the Mysore Village Panchayats and Local Boards Bill, 1959, as reported by the Joint Select Committee and as amended, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

MYSORE TENANCY LAWS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1959.

Motion to consider.

†Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue).—I beg to move:

"That the Mysore Tenancy Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1959, be taken into consideration."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

"That the Mysore Tenancy Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1959, be taken into consideration."

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA—Sir, I do not propose to advance elaborate arguments in support of the Bill. It is a simple measure. Hon'ble Members are aware that on 1st November 1956 there were different laws in the different regions of the State governing tenancy. With a view to enact uniform legislation, certain interim arrangements were made in that connection and Acts No. 13, 14, 15 and 16 were passed in that year 1957. The provisions of those enactments are due to expire during the calendar year. The Mysore Land Reforms Bill which has been introduced in this Hon'ble House is not likely to become law before the end of this year. Therefore, with a view to extend the life of these enactments, the present Bill is introduced, I commend this measure for the kind consideration of this House.

†Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY (Coondapur).—Sir, this piece of legislation seeks to help the tenant classes. My Hon'ble friend on the other side was pleased to say that we were accustomed—I do not know whether he referred to the practice of this Government to come with piecemeal legislation in instalments with the object of helping the tenants; in actual practice, we find that it has become their habit.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—This is not a piecemeal legislation. This is brought forward with a view to extend the life of the legislation.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—Whose life is extended, I do not know by this.

(SRI V. SRINIVAS SHETTY)

It is the extension of the life of a promise which is more than 30 to 40 years. We know the intentions of the Government are quite otherwise. I should like to say a few words with regard to the working of this Act. I personally and many people from my District, Sir, have again and again, represented in regard to the working of this piece of legislation. This piece of legislation was brought to life by the then Madras Government and this Government gave life to it, time and again with an assurance that a radical land legislation will follow this piece of legislation. With that idea, this piece of legislation was given life again and again within the space of six months or one year. This legislation envisages certain number of courts for fixation of rents. I am really sorry to say that this Government are not serious and are simply dabbling with the idea of land legislation. The Hon'ble Minister, I know, will immediately snap back and say there is legislation before the House, a very radical legislation. The idea of Nagpur resolution also will be trotted out to show that the ruling party is very serious about these things, but in practice, Sir, after this party came to power till now, in spite of what they have been professing, the practice is totally otherwise. There are a number of courts. My experience is confined to courts in South Kanara. There are a number of courts which are expected to retain the position of tenants.

(DR. R. NAGAN GOWDA in the Chair)

For example, the revenue Assistant Commissioners are one set of courts which deal with the aspect of land: there are the courts of Tahasildars which are expected to fix fair rent as envisaged by this Act. Both the set of these officers or courts are revenue officials. We have brought this fact before the Government again and again and we have been assured that things will move forward with more speed. I request the Government to call for the statistics of the rent courts even now. Hardly 10 per cent of the petitions have been disposed of. For years and years these petitions have been piling up without the Tahasildars attending to them because they have got vast number of other duties I should say it is only a farce of a court. We have been dinning to the Government again and again that these revenue officials should not be burdened with the task of enquiring into these petitions, into these disputes between landlords and tenants at all. The experience of the people or the tenants in South Kanara is very unhappy about it, and we will not be sorry if these courts are abolished and we are left to the mercies of the landlords themselves. I will give certain examples. In spite of the fact that no landlord is entitled to claim more than fair rent after the Act came into force, suits are being filed day in and day out on the old contracts and decrees being obtained. I have brought this matter before this House to urge that something must be done to make it obligatory on the part of landlords to file suits only for fair rents and not on agreements which have been existing for generations. Nothing has been done so far and the civil courts have gone on giving decrees on the old agreements in spite of the fact that they cannot obtain decrees for more than 40 per cent of the income of the property which is the fair rent fixed. In civil courts, as lawyers you know, formerly if a landlord filed a suit against a tenant, the tenant got time to file a case, and a number of years would be taken and he got considerable time to pay the amount.

What happens in practice is a land lord whether rightly or wrongly might have received the rent and without having passed a receipt files a suit against the tenant and an order is obtained against the tenant for eviction. It has been so now throughout my own district. I think it would have been better if this Act had not come into force at all. The tenant is evicted in no time. The old Act is much better because we would have got at least breathing space to pay the rent and remain in the plot. Another thing. In South Canara the tenant is

entitled to improvements. There are tenants who have been on the plot for generations, for hundreds of years and they are entitled to improvements. But under this Act they are not entitled to improvements at all. If an objection is filed before the Assistant Commissioner he simply asks the tenant: "Have you paid the rent"? He might be on the plot for hundreds of years but nothing is enquired into it. He passes order to pay the rent and if the rent is not paid the tenant is evicted. This is the farsical nature of the Acts prevailing now and these Acts are going to be extended. Even when this Government came into office I do not mean this Cabinet-for the last two years we are seeing the spectacle of this Government coming again and again for extending the Acts a number of times. I should like to make one thing clear as regards the intention of this Government. It is nearly eight months this Government announced a certain date for bringing land legislation. Two days before the announced date the Minister for Revenue introduced land legislation. I want to know what steps have this Government taken to fulfil their promise of bringing radical land legislation. We do not know what happens. The picture has changed. After Nagapur resolution, what is the shape of land legislation that is to come before this House we do not know. A number of changes are going to take place as far as I can understand. Whether it is Government took six months to call for the meeting of the Assembly. Having called the session Government had not the imagination, the courtesy, the generosity to allot enough time for discussing land legislation. They come at the fag end of the session for giving life to these unhappy pieces of legislation which do not help the tenants in any way. In fact they hurt the tenants. In the wake of promises the landlords have gone on grabbing lands in the possession of the tenants. To come up to the ceiling they must have enough lands and the tenants are being evicted. Harm is done to the tenants. Therefore intentions of the Government are not *bona fide* but they are *mala fide*. If they had not gone on giving life to these pieces of legislation, Government would have brought forth radical land reform.

I sincerely oppose this piece of legislation because this Government is not in a position, not inclined, or the party constituted as it is, is not in a position to bring in radical reforms. This is a mockery of legislation which does not help the tenants at all.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ (ಗುಬ್ಬಿ).—ನಾನು ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಈ ಒಂದು ನಿಮಿಷದ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಚಕಚಕ ಎಂದು ಒಂದು ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ ವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಸಲಹೆ ಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರಿಗೂ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ ವೆಂದು ತೋರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇವರು ಯಾವುದೇ ಒಂದು ಹೊಸಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರುವಾಗ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಷ್ಟುಕಾಲ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಅದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೋ ಕೆಟ್ಟದ್ದೋ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಮೊದಲು ನೋಡಬೇಕು. ಚಕಚಕ ಎಂದು ಮಸೂದೆಗಳನ್ನು ಗಿರ್ಲೊಟ್ಟೆಗೆ ಹಾಕುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಏನಾದರೂ ತೂಕ ತುಂದು ಇಟ್ಟ ಕೊಂಡು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಯೇ? ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ನೀತಿ ಒಂದು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ ವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ತಪ್ಪಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಯಾವ ಮರ್ಯಾದೆಯಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಈ ಮಸೂ ದೆಗೆ ಜೀವದಾನ ಕೊಡಿಎಂದು ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೋ ನನಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. 1957 ರಿಂದ ಇವತ್ತಿನವರೆಗೆ ಜೀವದಾನ ಮಾಡಿದಂಥ ಬಿಲ್‌ಗಳು ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಇವೆ. ಹಿಂದಿನ ಬಿಲ್‌ಗಳು ಪಾಸಾದ ರೀತಿ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿರು ವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನರಿಯಾದ ಅರ್ಹತೆಯಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಏತಕ್ಕೆಂದರೆ ಪ್ರಜಾ ಪ್ರಭುತ್ವವನ್ನು ಬೆಳೆಸುತ್ತೇವೆ, ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ನಾವುರಾಜ್ಯಭಾರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೆವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಲೆಜಿಸ್ಲೇಚರ್‌ನ ಅದ ನಮ್ಮ ಬಾಯಿಗೆ ಬೀಗ ಬಡಿದು ಅನೇಕ ಬಿಲ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದಿರಿ. ಈ ನಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಕಲಾಪಗಳು ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂವಿನ ಎತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯ ಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದಿತೋ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೀಗಹಾಕಿ ಅನೇಕ ಮಸೂದೆಗಳನ್ನು ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದಿರಿ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ರ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರಿಫಾರಮ್ಸ್ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಿಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಒಳಜಗಳ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗುತಿದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಈ ಒಂದು ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರುವು ದಕ್ಕೇ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಇಲ್ಲದ ಜನ ನೀವು ಯಾರಿಗೋನ್ಮರ ರಾಜ್ಯಭಾರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಏತಕ್ಕೋನ್ಮರ ಇಲ್ಲ ಮಂಡಿನತಕ್ಕ ಮಸೂದೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಜೀವದಾನಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ನೀವು ಮಾಡುವ ಕೆಲನ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳಿಗೆ ತೂಕ, ಬೆಲೆ ಏನಾ ದರೂ ಇದೆಯೇ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಥಾದ್ದನ್ನೇನಾ ದರೂ ಒಂದುವೇಳೆ ಒಪ್ಪಬಹುದು. ತಾವು ಆಡಿದ ಮಾತಿಗೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ಬೆಲೆಯಿದೆಯೇ, ಜೀವದಾನ ಮಾಡಿ ಇನ್ನೂ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪಕಾಲ ಈ ರೀತಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಭಾರ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ)

ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಮನಸ್ಸೇನಾದರೂ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬಂದಿದೆಯೇ ಏನೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಿಂದೆ ರಾಮ, ಅಶೋಕ ಅಂಥವರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಭಾರಮಾಡಿ ಹೋಗಲಲ್ಲವೇ? ಹಾಗಿದ್ದಮೇಲೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪನವರು ಮತ್ತು ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಸುಬ್ರಹ್ಮಣ್ಯ ಅವರು ಇನ್ನೆಷ್ಟು ದಿವಸ ರಾಜ್ಯಭಾರ ಮಾಡಬಲ್ಲರು! ತಮ್ಮ ಕೈಯ್ಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಭಾರವನ್ನು ಕತ್ತು ಬೇರೆಯವರ ಕೈಲಿ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಲೇಸು. ಬಿಸಿನೆಸ್ ಅಡ್ವೈಜರಿ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸೇರಿಸಿದಿರಿ. ಇವತ್ತು, ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾಯಮಾಡಿದಿರಿ. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಬಿಸಿನೆಸ್ ಅಡ್ವೈಜರಿ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ಕಾನೂನು ಕಟ್ಟಳೆ ಈಗ ಏನಾಯಿತು? ಏತಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತಂದು 30ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನಿಂದ ಈ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ? ಯಾರಿಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಶ್ರೀ ರಾಚಯ್ಯನವರು ನಮ್ಮ ಆಡಳಿತ ಹಿತಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತಾರೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರಿಫಾರಮ್ಸ್ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾವ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಹಂಚುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ತರುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೋ ನನಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಏತಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಜೀವದಾನಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ? ನತ್ತ ಶವಕ್ಕೆ ನಜೀವದಾನ ಮಾಡಿದಂತಾಗಿದೆ. ಇವತ್ತಿನದಿವಸ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ನಗುವರೀತಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಶಾಸನಗಳಾಗುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಆ ಶಾಸನಗಳೆಲ್ಲ ಪಾಸಾಗಿ ಶಾಸನಗಳ ಕಡಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರುವರೀತಿ ನೋಡಿದರೆ, ಒಂದು ಅರೆಘಳಿಗೆಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ತಮ್ಮ ಪದವಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ರಾಯಕ್ಕಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಿನ್ನೆಯ ದಿವಸ ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪನವರು ಕೆಲವುಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿನ ಭೂಮಿಯ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಗತಿಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಜಮೀನುಗಳಿಗತಿ ಏನಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆಯೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಾಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಇಂತಹಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಡರೈತನಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಜಮೀನು ಕೊಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ಒಂದು ಸರಿಯಾದ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಶಕ್ತಿಇಲ್ಲದ ಜನ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಈಗ ಜೀವದಾನಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಇಂತಹ ಅಪವಾದವನ್ನು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರೂಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ, ಯಾರೂಮಾಡಿಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಅಪರಾಧಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಹೋದರೆ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಕೋರ್ಟಿನ ಮುಂದೆ ನಿಮ್ಮ ತಲೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾರಿಸಿಬಿಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿಯೇ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಎಚ್ಚರಿಕೆಯಿಂದ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಯಾವ ರೈತನನ್ನು ಪ್ರೊಟೆಕ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟೊ ಅನ್ಯಾಯಗಳು ಭೂಮಿಯ ಹಂಚಿಕೆಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಏನು ಬಾಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರೋ ಅದು ಕಾರ್ಯತಃ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಿಮಗೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ಶಕ್ತಿ ನಿಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಧೈರ್ಯವಾಗಿಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಅಧಿಕಾರದ ಆಸೆಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಮತ್ತು ಆ ಒಂದು ಅಧಿಕಾರದ ಅಮಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವು ಏನೇನೋ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಯಾವದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯದಿಂದಲೇ ಜೀವನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೋ, ಜಮೀನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಯಾವನು ಜೀವನ ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಾನೋ ಅಂತಹ ರೈತನಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನು ಮಾಡಿ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಹಂಚುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇರುವಜನ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಜೀವದಾನಮಾಡಿ, ಗೋದಾನ ಮಾಡಿ, ಭೂದಾನಮಾಡಿ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಕೇಳುವುದು ನ್ಯಾಯವೇ? ಒಂದುಕಡೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಏನೋಬ ಭಾವೆಯವರು ಸಂಪತ್ತು ದಾನಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನೀವು ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಇನ್ನುಮುಂದೆ ಭೂಮಿ ಹಂಚುವಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಸಹಕಾರ ನೀಡಿ, ದೇಶದ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಇಂತಹ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳಿಗೆ ಜೀವದಾನಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಪ್ರಾಂತ ಸರ್ಕಾರಗಳಿಗೆ ಪಂಡಿತ ನೆಹರೂ ಅವರೇ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅರೀತಿ ಕಾನೂನುಮಾಡಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ನಿಮಗೆ ಶಕ್ತಿಯಿಲ್ಲ. ನಿಮಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಎಲ್ಲಿ ಹೋಗಿಬಿಡುತ್ತದೋ ಎಂದು ಒಂದು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಭೂತ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಬೆನ್ನುಹತ್ತಿದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಗೆ ಜೀವದಾನ ಕೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಬಡವರ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ, ವ್ಯವಸಾಯಗಾರರ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಮತ್ತು ಬಹುಜನರ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನೀವು ಇದನ್ನು ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳದೇ ಹೋದರೆ ಏನು ಪ್ರಯೋಜನ? ಈಗ ಈ ಒಂದು ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಪಾಸ್‌ಮಾಡಿಬಿಟ್ಟು ತಾವು ಹೆಮ್ಮೆ ಪಡತಕ್ಕ ಕಾಲವಲ್ಲ. ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಉಪಕಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಬೇಕು. ಆಗ ಮಾತ್ರ ಆ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳಿಂದ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಜನಗಳು ಸುಖವಾದಂಥ ಜೀವನವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅಂತಹ ಸುಖೀ ರಾಜ್ಯವನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಮತ್ತು ಈಗ ಸರಕಾರ ಇಂತಹ ಜೀವದಾನ ಕೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆಮುನ್ನ ಇದರ ಹಿನ್ನೆಲೆ ಏನಿದೆ, ಎಲ್ಲ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ತಪ್ಪುಮಾಡಿದೆ, ಜನರ ಆಕಾಂಕ್ಷೆ ಏನಿದೆ, ಬಹುಜನರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಮನಗಂಡು ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲ ನಮಗೆ ಮೆಜಾರಿಟಿ ಇದೆ. ನಾವು 148 ಜನರಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅವರು ಕೇವಲ 58 ಜನರಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನೀವು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಅದುನರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಅಗ್ರೇರಿಯರ್ ರಿಫಾರಮ್ಸ್ ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿದರು ಆಗ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಇನಾಂ ರದ್ದಿಯಾತಿ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತಂದರು. ಅದು ರೈತನ ಹೊಟ್ಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹುಟ್ಟಿದವರು ಒಂದು ಹೆಮ್ಮೆ ಪಡತಕ್ಕ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈಗಲೂ ಸರಿಯೆ. ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಇರುವವರು ಅಧಿಕಾರಮಾಡಲಿ. 30 ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನೊಳಗೆ ಈ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್‌ರಿಫಾರಮ್ಸ್ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಿ, ಕಾನೂನುಮಾಡಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ತಾವು ಮೊದಲೇ ಆಶ್ವಾಸನೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರಿ. ಇವತ್ತಿನದಿವಸ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಆನುಡಿ ಏನು ತೋರಿನುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೀವೇ ಯೋಚಿಸಿ. ಈಗ ನಿಮಗೆ ದಿಗಿಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಎಲ್ಲಿ ಜಮೀನ್ದಾರರೆಲ್ಲಾ ನಮ್ಮ ಮೇಲೆ ಬೀಳುತ್ತಾರೋ ಎಂದು. ಏತಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಇನ್ನಾರು ತಿಂಗಳು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಗೆ ಜೀವದಾನವನ್ನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ? ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಗೆ ಆರು ತಿಂಗಳವರೆಗೆ ಜೀವದಾನ ಕೇಳುವುದರಿಂದ, ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಆಯಸ್ಸಿಗೋಸ್ಕರ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮಾನ ಮರ್ಯಾದೆ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮಂಡಲದಲ್ಲದ್ದುಕೊಂಡು ನೀವುಮಾಡುವ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಕೆಲಸಗಳಿಗೂ ಇದರಿಂದ ಗೌರವ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವಕ್ಕೆ ಬೆಲೆಯಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ ಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರವಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಬಹಳ ವಿನಯದಿಂದ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ತಂದಿರುವ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲೇ ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ. ಜೂನ್ ತಿಂಗಳಿಂದಲೇ ಅಗ್ರೇರಿಯರ್ ರಿಪಾರಮ್ಸ್

ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬನ್ನಿ. ಆಗ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಪೊಟಿಂಗ್ ಕರೆದು, ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಿ ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಏನು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೋ ಅಂಥಾದನ್ನು ಮಾಡೋಣ. ಆ ಒಂದು ಹಿನ್ನೆಲೆ ಮೇಲೆಯೇ ಇಂತಹ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈಗ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಗಂಪಿನಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಕಾದಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಏತಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಅವರು ಈ ನಾಟಕವಾಡುತ್ತಾರೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಹತ್ತು ಜನ ಹೋದರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಜನಗಳು ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಘಳಿಗೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹುಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೇನೇ ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಐದು ವರ್ಷಗಳವರೆಗೂ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಭಾರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ನಾನು ಇದನ್ನು ಬಹಳ ಕಠಿಣವಾದ ಹೃದಯ ವೇದನೆಯಿಂದ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇಂತಹ ಜೀವದಾನ ಬೇಡ. ಇಂತಹ ಮಸೂದೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಜೀವದಾನ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತರುವುದರಿಂದ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಕೀರ್ತಿಗೆ, ಆಡಳಿತ ದಕ್ಷತೆಗೆ ಕುಂಠಿತ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ನಿಮ್ಮನ್ನು ದೇಶ ಭ್ರಷ್ಟರು ಎಂದು ಜನ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಜನತೆಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಎಚ್ಚರಿಕೆಯಿಂದ ಕಾಪಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿ ಈಗ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ಟೆನೆನ್ಸಿಲಾಸ್ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಜೀವದಾನ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಂದಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ವಿರೋಧಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆಂದ ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪನವರು ಮನನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಹೋದರೂ ಅವರು ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಕೆಲಸಗಳು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಉಳಿಯುತ್ತವೆ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿ ಮತ್ತೊಮ್ಮೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ವರಿಗೆ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಒತ್ತಿ ಹೇಳಿ, ನಾನು ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

5 P.M.

†Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—This Tenancy Laws (Amendment) Bill is coming before this House repeatedly as a continuation bill and I am certain that it will continue to come up for atleast another half-a-dozen times. Despite the heralding pronouncements of our Revenue Minister, despite the sympathetic attitude of the Chief Minister, I am sure that this amendment bill will be brought again before us in more or less the same form probably in December or whenever the House meets.

Sir, on previous occasions there could have been a possible argument that in a complicated matter like regulating relationship between the landlord and the tenant, one should not hurry and some delay was justified. But in the year 1959, there could absolutely be no excuse particularly in this State because we have had two advantages. There are several such enactments in the areas that merged with this State, particularly in the Hyderabad and Bombay area, which conferred certain rights on the tenants. The minimum that could have been done was to extend the laws to other parts of the State, because however unsatisfactory these laws are they are atleast better than what exists here now. Then again there was the report of the Jatti Committee before the Government and before this House. If the Government had any amount of seriousness, they would certainly have come forward with a legislation and we would have seen to it that it became law. As if these were not enough, we had before us a draft legislation introduced last year. May be that this draft is unsatisfactory from the point of view of many Congressmen. This is strange because usually, it is the Opposition that expresses disagreement in regard to laws proposed by the ruling party. But on this particular question it is the members of the Congress party, the ruling party, that are at loggerheads. The Congress is wedded to save the tenant from the clutches of the landlord ; it is wedded to socialism—so they say. From those whom we except would bring in legislation, there is confusion. There is a war of nerves in the ruling party itself, not in the Opposition. When this is the state of affairs, do you mean to say that anybody can take seriously the assurances held out by the Minister? I might remind the Revenue Minister of what happened to one of the amendments, the Second Amendment to the Mysore Tenancy Act which he himself piloted in the year 1954? The same state of affairs continued in the old Mysore area. Even though he brought forward an amendment, it could not be enforced. When this is the state of affairs, it is difficult for us to expect that a suitable tenancy law would be passed. It is not merely an academie question as to what should constitute the various rights and the elements of a satisfactory tenancy law? I can very well understand there might be difficulties even after all the issues are

(SRI M. C. NARASIMHAN)

settled. But the serious thing to which attention should presently be directed is, what are the transitory arrangements that they have made. The moment Government take a decision to bring forward a tenancy law, the first consequence will be that there will be large scale evictions. This is nothing new that should be pointed out by the Opposition, but this is a thing which is within the personal knowledge of every Revenue Minister worth his salt. This has been pointed out also by the Jatti Committee. This was the experience in Bombay and Hyderabad. Even though the enactment to regulate tenancies and to give protection to tenants was there, the legislative protection was in practice not available. That was what was pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition in relation to the Madras area. When this is the experience before the Government, what are the transitory measures that they have made? Are they satisfactory? Have they ensured the right of the tenants against eviction? My submission is that there is no satisfactory arrangement in this matter. I will point out one defect in respect of this.

There is an amendment proposed to the Mysore Act 13 of 1957, namely the Bombay Tenancy (Suspension of Provisions and Amendment) Act 1957. By virtue of this Suspension Act was sought to be achieved was the suspension of section 31 of the Bombay Tenancy Act. The obvious intention was that neither the tenants nor the landlords should have certain rights which they would have got under that Act. I may read out one particular sub-clause to bring out my meaning:

> "Notices given to tenants under section 31 before the 11th day of March 1957 shall not have any effect and all applications made by landlords in pursuance of the provision of the said section for possession of land shall on the 11th March 1957 stand dismissed:
>
> Provided that the amount of court fees paid by the landlords on such applications shall be refunded to them."

I think that the purpose of this particular section was to see that the tenants who were likely to be evicted prior to 11th March 1957 were protected and that all applications made by landlords for possession for *bona fide* cultivation in terms of section 31 would stand dismissed, but what has in effect happened is that by virtue of the several decisions of the Revenue Appellate Tribunal and the various tenancy courts only applications for possession made by landlords after 1st August 1956 have been dismissed and other applications for possession made by landlords prior to 1st August 1956 have been allowed. Thus an unjust distinction has been made by the Revenue Appellate Tribunal and the tenancy courts in the State and that is due to a defect in the enactment and a number of tenants have been evicted for the simple reason that the landlords made applications for possession of land prior to 1st August 1956. A plain reading of the section would indicate that any application made prior to 11th March 1957 would stand dismissed, but that view was not taken because there is a reference in this particular clause to section 31. What happened was that after the 1956 amendment to the Bombay Act section 31 was made equivalent to section 34 as it stood prior to the 1956 amendment so much so that a technical view was taken and all tenancies prior to 1st August 1956 were determined. Today there are a large number of tenants who have been dispossessed of their lands by the landlords. This is obviously unjust because of the pronounced intentions of the Jatti Committee report was to see that all evictions are stopped whatever may be the ground and whatever may be the date of application for possession of land by the landlords. At any rate that was what was mentioned in the statement of objects and reasons while introducing the Bombay Tenancy (Suspension of Provisions and Amendment) Act, 1957. That also stands to reason, but actually in practice this is what has happened and this matter was brought to the notice of Government. I presume Government should have been aware of it even

prior to anybody could bring it to their notice because there are a number of decisions by the Revenue Appellate Tribunal. What is the action taken by Government? No action has been taken. Government are keeping quiet. The result is that a distinction has been made and as a result of that a large number of tenancies have been determined in the Bombay area and a large number of tenants have been deprived of their lands. Obviously, even if we bring a new Land Reform Bill which appears to be the intention of the Government, these tenants whose tenancies have been determined will not be entitled to any protection even in terms of the new Land Reforms Bill because the landlords would be in possession of the lands and they would claim the right of personal cultivation and those people who ought to have been rightly entitled to the benefit of any land reform enactment will be deprived of that. I understand that some of their petitions are pending before the High Court. The only remedy left to them is to take the matter to the Supreme Court, but that remedy will not be available to these poor tenants. This is the fate of a large number of tenants in a State which pledges to protect the interests of tenants. What is surprising is that if you take sub-clause (2) of clause 2 it is really interesting because (*i*) of sub-clause (2) refers to 31st day of March 1960. There are certain rights which are likely to be conferred by the Bombay Act. One of that is the right to purchase the land by tenants. This is a very important right and that is also stated in the proposed draft of the Land Reforms Bill.

That is, termination of tenancy for personal cultivation and non-agricultural use; these two rights will not be there till the 31st March 1960. I cannot understand how this could come in. If it is the intention of the Government that is what they say repeatedly— if it is the intention of the Government to bring land reform legislation by June 1959 or thereabouts, why should it go up to 31st March 1960 I cannot understand at all. Then that means even now you are envisaging that the new land reforms Bill at any rate I shall not be uncharitable as to say that it will not come by June 1959—even granting that it comes somewhere in June 1959, these rights guarantee to the Bombay tenants will not be made available up to 31st March 1960. That is why I am entitled to question the intention of the Government and I am extremely apprehensive as to whether they will be able to fulfil their promise, as to whether they will be able to bring any thing tangible before 31st March 1960.

Then the next thing is, amendment of Mysore Act 14 of 1957. This is also a thing which I cannot understand at all. Because what is sought by clause 3 of the Mysore Tenancy Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1959 is suspension of section 8 of the Coorg Tenants Act. There is a difference between the Bombay Tenancy Act and the Hyderabad, Madras and Mysore Tenancy Act as against the Coorg Tenants Act. In the Coorg Tenancy Act, 1957 there is no question of suspension of any of the tenancy provisions as contemplated in relation to the Bombay Tenancy Act, etc. By virtue of clause 3 of this Bill, they are seeking to suspend only what is contained in section 8. If you read section 8, I think my point will be clear.

> "During the period commencing on and from the 11th day of March 1957, and ending on the 30th day of June 1959 notwithstanding any thing contained in any law, for the purpose of ensuring the full and efficient use of land for agriculture, the State Government shall assume the management of all lands surrendered under section 7 and the State Government shall in respect of the assumption of management of the land pay to the landlord the compensation specified in sub-section (3)."

The point is this. Under section 8 of the Coorg Tenants Act, it was provided that a tenant may at any time surrender his rights in any land leased to him in favour of the

(SRI M. C. NARASIMHAN)

mamlatdar. Under section 8 of the Act, it requires that the Government could assume those lands which are surrendered befor the mamlatdar or the subedar and manage the lands in any manner they like or in the manner prescribed in particular section. It is only section 8 that is suspended and not section 7. Section 7 would come into operation by 31st December 1959; by virtue of this amendment, it would be postponed to 31st December 1959. What appears to me is that, a tenant in Coorg area by virtue of section 7 can surrender the land to the landlord before the mamlatdar, but the only consequence of this amendment would be that the State Government would not assume responsibility for the management. This is a very anomalous position. So a tenant can surrender the land, but Government will say "Till 31st December 1959 we shall not assume responsibility." What is this?

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—You suggest that sections 7 and 8 should be amended; is that right?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—I am on the point of defect. It is for the Minister to do what he deems necessary. I cannot understand this at all. A tenant will go and surrender the land to the landlord, but it will not be available for such purposes as are laid down in sections 8 and 11. Because section 8 which is the operative portion of the whole enactment is suspended till 31st December 1959. I cannot understand the logic behind it. I have not very much to say in respect of the other section.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Where is it proposed to suspend the operation of that particular section?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I was referring to the Coorg Tenants Act.

Clause 3 of the Bill:

"In sub-section (1) of section 8 of the Coorg Tenants Act, 1957, for the words and figures "30th day of June 1959" the words and figures "31st day of December 1959" shall be substituted."

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—The State Government shall assume management during that period.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—It would mean that up to 31st December 1959 you will assume management. So far as the Mysore Act and the Hyderabad and Madras Areas Tenancy Act are concerned, they are based on a similar provision as in the case of Bombay. I would only submit one thing. As against Bombay and Mysore there is a certain discrimination because in the case of the Mysore Act, also the old Mysore Act, the tenancy provision is suspended and they are entitled to certain protection but that protection is not available to the tenant from Bomby area because as I have already submitted, it is only in relation to tenancy provision up to 1st August 1956 that provision is available.

With these observations, I close my speech.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ (ಹಿರಿಯೂರು).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತ ನಾಲ್ಕಾರು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳ ಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಮೊದಲನೇದಾಗಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ಕಾನೂನಾಗಲೀ Tenant ಆಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಉಳುವವನಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಒಡೆಯನಿಗೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಸಂಬಂಧವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತ ಉಳುವವನೇ ಭೂಮಿಯ ಒಡೆಯನನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುವ ಭಾವನೆಯನ್ನು ತರುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಈ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಎಂತಹದೇ ಆಗಲೀ ಶಕ್ತಿಯಿಂದ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವಾಗ ಜಮೀನಿರುವವನ ಮನಸ್ಸು ಕರಳುತ್ತದೆ ಮತ್ತು ನಾನಾ ವಿಧವಾದ ದುಷ್ಪರಿಣಾಮಗಳು ಆಗಲು ಕಾರಣವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ನನ್ನ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುತ್ತ ಭಾವನೆಯಿಂದ ನಾನಾರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಇದರ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಗೆ ಸೇರದಂತೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಇದು ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಪ್ಪಬೇಕಾದ ಮಾತು. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಜಮೀನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿರುವವನಿಂದ ಜಮೀನು ಪಡೆಯುವಾಗ ಆತನ ಮನಸ್ಸು ಕರಳುತ್ತದೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ಭಾವನೆ ಬಹಳ ಹಿಂದಿನ ಕಾಲದಿಂದಲೂ ಬಂದಿದೆ. 49ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಗೋಡು ಸತ್ಯಾಗ್ರಹ ಇದೇ ಭಾವನೆಯಿಂದ ಆಗಿ ಜಮೀನು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕವರಿಗೇ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತ ಆಗಿನಿಂದ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೂ ಬರೀ ಬಾಯಿಮಾತಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಕೆಲಸ ನಡೆಯುವಂತೆ ಸಮನ್ವಯವಾಗಿ ಬಗೆಹರಿಸಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವಂತೆ ಇದ್ದರೂ ಕೆಲಸ ನಡೆಯದೇ ಇರಲು ಬಹಳ ಹಿಂದಿನಿಂದಲೂ ಇದ್ದ ನರಕಾರದ ಮನೋಭಾವನೆ ಮತ್ತು ಇನ್ನು ಅನೇಕ

ಕಾರಣಗಳು ಎದ್ದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತವೆ. 1957 ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಪೊಟ್ಟಪೊದಲನೆ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬಂದಾಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಮಹಾರಾಜರ ಎಂದರೆ ಆಗ ಗವರ್ನರಾಗಿದ್ದವರ ಬಾಯಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ನುಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ಅವರ ಆಡ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಇದೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ದಿವಸಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಜಮೀನು ಮಾಡತ ಕ್ಕವರಿಗೇ ಜಮೀನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಅಂತಹ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಮನುಷ್ಯರ ಬಾಯಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ನುಡಿಸಿದ ಸರಕಾರ ಇದರ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಹಿಂಜರಿಯುತ್ತ ಎಷ್ಟು ಸಂಕುಚಿತ ಭಾವನೆಗಳಿಂದ, ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾದಷ್ಟು ಮುಂದು ವರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ಆಡಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಜಮೀನ್ದಾರರಿಂದ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ವರ್ತಿಸುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಜಮೀನು ಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವವರಿಗೆ ಜಮೀನು ಸಿಕ್ಕದೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಇದರಿಂದೇನು ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ? ಈ ರೀತಿ ಯಾಗಿ ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುವ ಭಾವನೆ ಏನೋ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿದೆ.

5-30 P.M.

ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಬಹಳವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಲಂಬಿಸಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಪುನರುಕ್ತಿ ದೋಷಕ್ಕೆ ಒಳಗಾಗಬಾರದು. ಮೇಲಿಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ನೀವು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಅನೇಕಸಾರಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇಂಗ್ಲೀಷಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುವುದಾ ದರೆ, You are not tackling the problem, but you are tickling the problem.' ಅದನ್ನು ಹಿಂದೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ; ಈಗಲೂ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ ಈಗ ಏನಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದರೆ, ನೀವು ಯಾವ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಸಾಧನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೊರಟಿದ್ದೀರೋ ಆ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ನೀವು ಹಿಡಿದಿರುವ ಮಾರ್ಗದಿಂದ ಸಾಧನೆ ಆಗುವಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಜಮೀನು ಹೋಗ ಬೇಕೋ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸಿಗದಹಾಗೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೋದ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರಿಫಾರಂ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಕೊನೆಯದಿವಸ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೇನು? ಕೊನೆಯ ದಿವಸ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಇಂಟ್ರೋಡ್ಯೂಸ್ ಮಾಡಿ ದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೇನು? ಹೋದ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಯಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಮಸೂದೆಗಳು ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಬಂದವು. ಈ ಸಾರಿಯೂ ಪ್ರೊವಿಶನಲ್ ಪೋರ್ಲಿಯಾಮೆಂಟಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣ ವೇನು? ಈ ಪ್ರೊವಿಶನಲ್ ಪೋರ್ಲಿಯಾಮೆಂಟಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೇನು? ಈ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಬಗೆಹರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ನೆಪದಿಂದ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಾ? ಬೀಸುವ ದೊಣ್ಣೆ ತಪ್ಪಿಸಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ, ಮುಂದೆ ನೋಡೋಣ ಎನ್ನುವ ಭಾವನೆ ಇದ್ದಹಾಗೆ ಇದೆ. ಈಗ ಬೀಸುವ ದೊಣ್ಣೆ ತಪ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು, ಮುಂದೆ ಒಂದು ಕಾನ್ ಫೆರೆನ್ಸಿನಿಂದ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಷ್ ಒಂದರೆ, ಬರಲಿ, ಅಲ್ಲಯವರೆಗೆ ತಳ್ಳೋಣ ಎನ್ನುವ ಮನೋಭಾವನೆ ಇದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ನೀವು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಲ್ಲದೆಹೋದರೆ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಟೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೇಳು ತ್ತೀರಾ? ಹಿಂದೆಯೂ ಇದೇರೀತಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ದಿನಗಳಲ್ಲಯೇ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರಿಫಾರ್ಮ್ಸ್ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಆಶ್ವಾಸನೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರಿ. ಹಾಗೆ ಜಾಗ್ರತೆ ತರುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಈಗ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಟೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದರೆ, ನು ಮ್ಮ ನಿರುವುದಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಪ್ರತಿಭಟನ ಲಿಕ್ಕೇ ಬೇಕು; ವಿರೋಧಿಸಲಿಕ್ಕೇಬೇಕು, ನೀವು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ವಿಧಾನವನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವು ಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಭೂಮಿಯ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಬಗೆಹರಿಸು ವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾರದೋ ಮುಲಾಜಿಗೆ ಒಳ ಗಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರಿಫಾರ್ಮ್ಸ್ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತಡಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ದೊಡ್ಡ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಮನುಷ್ಯರ ಬಾಯಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತರುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಬಿಟ್ಟು, ಅವರ ಮಾತಿಗೆ ಬೆಲೆ ಇಲ್ಲದಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡ ಬೇಡಿರಿ. ಗವರ್ನರ್‌ವರು ಒಂದು ನರ್ತಿ ಹೇಳಿದರು, ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮತ್ತೆ ಸಾರಿಹೇಳಿದರು. ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪನವರು ಮುಂದಿನ ಸೆಶನ್ನಿನೊಳಗೆ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಇಂಟ್ರೊಡ್ಯೂಸ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಈ ಭೂಮಿಯ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಬಗೆಹರಿಸಿಬಿಡುತ್ತೇ ವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ನಮ್ಮ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪನ ವರು, 1949ನೆ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಗೋಡು ಸತ್ಯಾಗ್ರಹ, ವಾಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾಗ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಬಗೆಹರಿಸದೆ ಹೋದರೆ, ಸತ್ಯಾಗ್ರಹ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಿಂಜರಿಯುವು ದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ ಸುಮಾರು ಹತ್ತು ವರ್ಷಗಳಾಗುತ್ತಾ ಬಂದವು. ಅವರ ಸತ್ಯಾಗ್ರಹ ನಮ್ಮ ಕಣ್ಣಿಗೆ ಕಾಣಲೇ ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ (ಕಂದಾಯ ಶಾಖೆಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು).—ಟೆನೆನ್ಸಿ ಆಕ್ಟ್ ಅಪ್ಲೈ ಮಾಡಿದವನು ನಾನೇ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—ಹನುಮಂತಪ್ಪನವರು ಏನ್ ಕ್ಯಯರಿ ಮಾಡಿರಬಹುದು. ಆ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟು ತಮ್ಮ ಹತ್ತಿರವಿರಬಹುದು. ಆ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟಿನ ಅನುಭವವನ್ನೂ ತಾವು ಪಡೆದಿರಬಹುದು. ತಮ್ಮ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲ ಉಳಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಬಲವಾದ ಕಾರಣಗಳು ಬಂದಿರುವ ದೆಶೆಯಿಂದ, ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗು ತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಬೀಸುವ ದೊಣ್ಣೆ ತಪ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಂಡರೆ ನಿಮಗೆ ಸಾಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ನಾವು ತಂದಿರುವ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪು ವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರಿಫಾರ್ಮ್ಸ್ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ನನ್ನಾದರೂ ಇಟ್ಟು ಕೊಳ್ಳಿ. ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಡಿಮೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ತಿದ್ದಿಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ. ಹೇಗಾದರೂ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಜಾಗ್ರತೆಯಾಗಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬನ್ನಿ. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಒಂದು ಅಂತಸ್ತನ್ನಾದರೂ ಕಂಡುಹಿಡಿಯೋಣ. ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತಂದರೆ, ನಮ್ಮ ಸಾಹಸವಿದ್ದಷ್ಟು ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡೋಣ. ನಮ್ಮ ಅಂತಸ್ತಿಗೆ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಬಂದರೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. ಮುಂದುವರೆಯಿರಿ, ಮುಂದು ವರೆಯಿರಿ ಎಂದರೆ, ನೀವು ಕೂತು ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರೆ, ನಮ್ಮ ವಿರೋಧವಿದೆ.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, Hon'ble Members on the other side spoke as though nothing has been done since 1947 in the State. I should remind the Hon'ble Member that in all the areas of the State, Tenancy Acts are in force, the relationship between the landlord and the tenants are governed by these Tenancy Acts. There are provisions for fixing the fair-rent; there are provisions for protecting the tenant against unlawful eviction. My friend Shri Sreenivas Shetty was pleased to say that there has been wholesale evictions in South Kanara District. I

(SRI KADIDAL MANJAPPA)

am a neighbour so far as South Kanara District is concerned. No doubt evictions might have taken place in certain places—in a few cases in South Kanara District, but they were only one per cent, 99 per cent of the tenants are protected on account of the enactments that were already in force there. I come from an area where 75 per cent of them are agriculturists. I know how much they have been harassed by the landlords, Because the tenancy Acts are in force there, they have been protected. On account of the negligence on the part of officials and on account of the illiteracy of the tenants, in some places, evictions might have taken place. I do not deny it. But I must emphatically say that the enactments now in force have protected the interests of the tenants to some extent and they have been protected against evictions ; though in a matter of fair-rent they might not have received justice at the hands of officials in some cases. In the old Mysore area, we have taken over nearly 1800 inam villages where the Tenancy Act is in force. As I have already submitted, the tenants have got some protection. Similarly in other regions where the enactments are in force, have given sufficient protection to the tenants ; in the Bombay region, Bombay Tenancy Act is there; in Hyderabad region, there is a Hyderabad Tenancy Act is there. I do not know why the Hon'ble members should try to give an impression that the Congress Party is trying to be influenced by the vested interests. If I may disclose a secret, while privately talking. at least some members on the other side have found fault with me on the plea that the Congress Party is trying to ruin the agriculturists and they are not giving the same treatment to the people living in the urban areas. Therefore let them not accuse the Congress Party. Let not the Hon'ble Members say that the Congress Party is very lukeworm in the matter of land reforms. During my private conversasation at least some members have spoken to me that the Congress Party is trying to ruin the agriculturists and that they are not giving the same treatment. Sri Srinivasa Shetty was pleased to say that the Government have not obtained statistics with regard to the pendency of cases in South Kanara District. Then I wrote to the Collector and got the information. According to the information furnished, there was no need for appointing special Tahasildars for dealing with pendency cases. In one Taluk, we have appointed a special Tahasildar.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ.—ಕೇಸಸ್ ಎಷ್ಟು ಡಿಸ್‌ಪೋಸ್ ಆಗಿವೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿ.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—The pendency is heavy as my friend assumes.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—What I said was petitions filed in these courts are pending for years and they are pending for years and they are not disposed of. There may be 100 or 200. I want to know how many petitions they have been disposed of and how many petitions they have been enquired into.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—He was pleased to suggest that it would have been far better if the Act did not come into force. I beg to differ.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—That is what the people feel now.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Some people may feel. In the enforcement of any law, there will be some difficulty.

Sri C. K. RAJAIAH SETTY.—Are you aware that because of the Bill, there were more evictions and more partitions ?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—There is no bar partition according to the law in force. I was told there might have been evictions in a few cases. That does not prove that the Tenancy Act is not effective in protecting the interest of the tenants. Some Hon'ble Members have questioned the motive of the Government. I am not happy to introduce Bills to prolong the life of certain enactments. I feel that it is very necessary. A time has come when we should take final decision on this question. This atmosphere of uncertainty should cease. I have assured the House that we are going to convene a special session mainly for the purpose of dealing with the Land Reforms Bill.

We are going to convene a session in the month of July or August, most probably in the month of July.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಬಿ. ಮುಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ಜುಲೈನಲ್ಲಿ ಕರೆದರೆ ಮಧ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಸೆಷನ್ ಕರೆಯಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆಗನ್ನು ತಿಂಗಳ ಕೊನೆಯ ವಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಮುಂದಿನ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ಅಧಿವೇಶನಕ್ಕೆ ಸರಿಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—We are not shelving the issue. Personally, I am against the postponement of this question.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—We believe you word when you say personally.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sri Narasimhan brought to my notice a few days ago that the Appellate Tribunal and the High Court have given certain interpretations to Act No. 13 of 1957. The matter is under examination and the Law Secretary is examining the question. If there is genuine difficulty, we are going to bring in an amendment. For the first time it has been brought to my notice that tenants are being evicted on account of certain interpretation given by Appellate Tribunal.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Don't you think that it is unfair. I know that you are getting it examined and all that. What I say is it was never the intention of the Government to allow such evictions.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—It was never the intention of the Government to allow such evictions, that have taken place. With these few observations, I once agoin appeal to the House that this is a useful measure and it should be passed today. I once again repeat that it is not the intention of the Government to shelve the question and cause hardships to the poor agriculturists.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—The question is:

"That the Mysore Tenancy Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1959, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—The question is:

"That Clauses 2 and 3 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 and 3 were added to the Bill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—Clause 4. There is an amendment by Sri Srinivas Shetty.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—I beg to move:

"That in line 4, for the words and figures '31st day of December, 1959,' the words and figures, '31st day of September, 1959' shall be substituted."

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—Amendment moved:

"That in line 4, for the words and figures '31 day of December 1959,' the words and figures, '31st day of September, 1959' shall be substituted."

†Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—Sir, I wish to say only one or two words. I listened to the speech of the Hon'ble Revenue Minister just now in respect of the certain allegations I have made as to the working of the Rent Courts in South Kanara. I have personally and otherwise made certain representations to the Hon'ble Minister and the Government. I once again repeat I know the Government will be able to get this Bill passed in spite of what we are going to say. The main purpose for which I brought this amendment is to pin-point certain defects in the working of the Act itself. When I say that the people in the District now begin to say that it would have been far better that this Act had not come into force. I gave an instance. Formerly when the suit was filed they used to get time for one or two years before they could pay rent and still they retained property. But now if the tenant does not pay rent for one or two years, he is immediately evicted. As is well known, the landlords are not in the habit of giving rent receipts to the tenants. The landlords know full well that some sort of legislation is in the offing and they are anxious to evict the tenant and not retain the tenant so that the relationship between the tenant and himself may be disrupted and so that the Act does not give any protection at all. A heavily worked revenue official should not be made to carry on rent courts. I again emphatically say that no Tahasildar has discharged his duties as rent court in South Kanara. I do not blame any

(SRI V. SRINIVAS SHETTY)

Tahasildar forthat because he is already heavily worked with all the development and other works, with collection of land revenue and other things, with Harijan welfare work, Block Development work and so many other things. In these circumstances, these rent courts meet once or twice a month. I have seen thousands of persons attending the courts from morning to evening; some clerk attends and receives the objection petitions and the cases are adjourned. Lawyers and clients wait all day and go away. This is repeated *ad nauseum*. Political parties have brought this to the notice of the Revenue Minister but these are taken so lightly. When I question the *bona fides* of the Government I say that these things are taken so lightly. The Hon'ble Minister was pleased to say that the pendency is not much, that number of objection petitions pending in certain rent courts may come to 200. I do not say it is a high pendency; but the point is the persons who are in charge of hearing the petitions are heavily worked; they have no time or inclination to dispose of this work. Their work is so perfunctory that no justice can be done. That is what I am going to say. If you are really intent upon giving help to the tenants, I give one example; this Government is bent upon introducing prohibition. Yesterday I came into conflict with the Law Minister when I stated that Government simply threw away 20 to 30 lakhs of rupees. I am repeating they had the temerity to throw away 30 or 40 lakhs and in a day they decided that prohibition should be introduced in Hassan District and one taluk in Bidar. The Governor in his speech and the Minister for Finance also made a statement that only one taluk in Hassan and one taluk in Bidar, prohibition would be introduced. One fine morning we read in papers that Government is going to introduce prohibition in the whole of Hassan District. They treated this House with most discourtesy just to please a few partymen without any compunction.

I think that with regard to these Rent Courts and also with regard to land reforms the same thing will be done. In spite of repeated applications to this Government, they do not care at all. They say pendency is not much. Do the Government want to give any help at all to the tenants? If they really wanted let them appoint a few more officers and spend a few thousands more when they are in a position to spend twenty or thirty lakhs over prohibition, to deal with these cases exclusively. There may be touring courts for South Canara District. But there may not be enough work. This argument that the Tahsildar can deal with objection petitions is not at all correct. It is not at all *bona fides* of the Government. That is why I say their intention are not really *bona fide* in these things. I do not want to be uncharitable but I say they are digging their own grave. It is too late in the day to say that we should not question their *bona fides*. Everybody knows what their *bona fides* is. If you can spend a few lakhs over prohibition, why don't you waste a few thousands more to give justice to the tenants by appointing special courts? As I already said I do not believe in the *bona fides* of the Government in their so-called expressed views that they really want to give benefit to the tenants.

With these few words I propose this amendment for the consideration of the House.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I have already said that necessary statistics have been obtained from the Collector. From the statistics I gather there is no heavy pendency. No doubt as the House knows that some cases are pending from a long time. But I do not hesitate to appoint special officers if need be.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—It is not a question of pendency. These courts are not in a position to give justice.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Then it is a question of giving jurisdiction to somebody else and not to the revenue officers. I may tell the House that throughout India, these tenancy

disputes are decided by revenue officers and not by judicial officers.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—I did not ask that revenue officers should be posted exclusively for these courts.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I will enquire and if there is need I will appoint special officers.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—The Bill may be taken up in the month of July.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Even if the Bill is discussed in the month of July it may not be possible to make it law before September. Therefore I am not prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—The question is :

"That in line 4, for the words and figures '31st day of December 1959' the words and fiures '31st day of September 1959' shall be snbstituted."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—I shall put clauses 4 to 15, both inclusive. The question is :

"That Clauses 4 to 15, both inclusive, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 4 to 15, both inclusive, were added to the Bill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—Clause 1, Title and Preamble. The question is :

"That Clause 1, the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, the Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sir, I move :

"That the Mysore Tenancy Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1959, be passed."

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—The question is :

"That the Mysore Tenancy Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1959, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

———.

MYSORE RENT CONTROL LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL, 1959.

Motion to consider.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue).—Sir, I move :

"That the Mysore Rent Control Laws Continuance Bill, 1959, be taken into consideration."

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—Motion moved :

"That the Mysore Rent Control Laws Continuance Bill, 1959, be taken into consideration."

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sir, in the different regions of the State, different laws with regard to the rent and accommodation control are in force The Bill was introduced in the Legislative Council and a motion to refer it to the Joint Select Committee of that House and this House has been passed by the Legislative Council. Pending enactment of uniform legislation it is necessary to continue the enactments in force in the different regions. Therefore the present Bill is introduced.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—The House will rise and meet at one o'clock tomorrow.

———

The House adjourned at Six of the Clock to meet again at One of the Clock on Wednesday, the 29th April 1959.

———

WD 797—GPB—900—26-9-60.